REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 9-16, 18, and 20 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Hence, Claims 1 - 20 are pending in the application.

THE REJECTIONS BASED ON THE PRIOR ART

Claims 1 - 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,062,541 to *Cannon*. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites in part:

merging the metadata from the second set of transport tables into a second set of one or more system tables at the target installation, wherein merging the metadata comprises transferring at least a portion of the metadata from the second set of transport tables into the second set of one or more system tables.

Cannon fails to teach or suggest the above claim limitations. *Cannon* is concerned with transferring a group of related objects while preserving the grouping. Cannon's process makes use of attribute information, such as a group identifier, to facilitate the transfer. However, Cannon does not teach merging metadata from transport tables into system tables, wherein merging the metadata comprises transferring at least a portion of the metadata from the second set of transport tables into the second set of one or more system tables, as claimed.

The Office Action interprets *Cannon's* import group tables (77) as being a second set of transport tables at a target installation (see Office Action, page 3). Moreover, the Office Action

interprets *Cannon's* object attributes tables (81) as being system tables at the target installation (see Office Action, page 3).

Cannon teaches that the object attributes tables (81) includes a flag, which indicates whether the group to which the data object may belong is resolved or not. Cannon teaches that, preferably, the flag is set if the data object 62 is a member of a group 65 that is as of yet unresolved. The flag preferably prohibits use of received data objects by the target server 30 or its clients until all members of the group 65 are received. If the group is resolved, then the flag corresponding to the field 98 in the object attributes table 81 of FIG. 4, is reset for all data objects 62 in the group 65 to indicate that the group 65 is now resolved (see step 129 of FIG. 6).

Setting a flag does not involve <u>merging of metadata, wherein merging the metadata</u> <u>comprises transferring at least a portion of the metadata from the second set of transport tables</u> <u>into the second set of one or more system tables,</u> as claimed. Note that setting a flag is simply changing a value between 0 and 1. Cannon does not transfer data from the import group table 77 to the object attribute table. Thus, there is no merging of metadata in Cannon, as claimed. In fact, a comparison of the fields of the import table 77 and object attribute table 81 (see FIG. 4) reveals that the ONLY field in common is the target group ID. There is no teaching that the target group ID field 87 in the import table 77 is transferred into the target group ID field 90 of the object attribute table 81.

Moreover, the metadata in Claim 1 is <u>exported from the source installation to the target.</u> Thus, in the context of the entire claim, the metadata that is merged at the target originated from the source installation. Moreover, Claim 1 recites that the metadata is <u>copied from system</u>

tables at the source installation. The flag in the attribute table of Cannon is in no way metadata that was copied from a system table at a source and exported to a target.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Claim 1 is allowable.

Independent Claim 9 includes similar limitations to those discussed in the response to Claim 1, and is therefore allowable.

The dependent claims are allowable by virtue of their dependence on an allowable Independent claim. The dependent claims comprise additional limitations that further distinguish over the art. However, the dependent claims will not be discussed at this time.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: August 30, 2007 _____/RonaldMPomerenke#43009/_____

Ronald M. Pomerenke
Reg. No. 43,009

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, CA 95110
(408) 414-1080
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION VIA EFS-WEB
Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.8(a)(1)(ii), I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the United States Patent & Trademark Office via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §§1.6(1)(4) and 1.8(a)(1)(i)(C) on the date indicated below and before 9:00 PM PST.
Submission date: ___August 30, 2007___   by _____/RonaldMPomerenke#43009/_____
Ronald M. Pomerenke